

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

IN RE THE BEAR STEARNS COMPANIES, INC.
SECURITIES, DERIVATIVE, AND ERISA
LITIGATION

This Document Relates To:
Securities Action, No. 08 Civ. 2793 (RWS)

BRUCE S. SHERMAN,

Plaintiff,

v.

BEAR STEARNS COMPANIES INC., JAMES CAYNE,
WARREN SPECTOR AND DELOITTE & TOUCHE
LLP,

Defendants.

Master File No.:
08 MDL 1963 (RWS)

ECF Case

Index No.:
09 Civ. 8161 (RWS)

FILED UNDER
SEAL

**DEFENDANTS' REPLY MEMORANDUM OF LAW IN FURTHER SUPPORT OF
THEIR MOTION TO EXCLUDE THE REPORT AND TESTIMONY
OF JOHN D. FINNERTY**

PAUL, WEISS, RIFKIND, WHARTON
& GARRISON LLP
Brad S. Karp
John F. Baughman
Jessica S. Carey
Jonathan H. Hurwitz
1285 Avenue of the Americas
New York, New York 10019-6064
(212) 373-3000
*Attorneys for Defendant The Bear Stearns
Companies Inc.*

KRAMER LEVIN NAFTALIS &
FRANKEL LLP
David S. Frankel
1177 Avenue of the Americas
New York, New York 10036
(212) 715-9100
Attorneys for Defendant James E. Cayne

WACHTELL, LIPTON, ROSEN & KATZ
David B. Anders
51 West 52nd Street
New York, New York 10019
(212) 403-1000
Attorneys for Defendant Warren J. Spector

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
TABLE OF AUTHORITIES	ii
PRELIMINARY STATEMENT.....	1
ARGUMENT	2
I. Finnerty’s Leakage Model Is Not Accepted or Peer Reviewed	2
II. Finnerty Has Not Adequately Controlled for Non-Fraud Information.....	3
A. Finnerty’s Methodology Is Hopelessly Flawed.....	3
B. Finnerty’s Leakage Model Produces Absurd Results.....	5
III. Finnerty Has Not Established that Leakage Caused Plaintiff’s Losses.....	6
IV. Finnerty’s Use of the Constant Dollar Method Is Not Reliable in this Case.....	8
V. Finnerty’s Other Opinions Should Be Excluded	9
CONCLUSION	10

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	Page(s)
Cases	
<i>Am. Home Assur. Co. v. Merck & Co.</i> , 462 F. Supp. 2d 435 (S.D.N.Y. 2006)	9
<i>Arista Records LLC v. Usenet.com, Inc.</i> , 608 F. Supp. 2d 409 (S.D.N.Y. 2009)	9
<i>Dura Pharmaceuticals, Inc. v. Broudo</i> , 544 U.S. 336 (2005)	1, 5, 9
<i>Glickenhause & Co. v. Household Int'l, Inc.</i> , 787 F.3d 408 (7th Cir. 2015)	4, 7
<i>Louis Vuitton Malletier v. Dooney & Bourke, Inc.</i> , 525 F. Supp. 2d 558 (S.D.N.Y. 2007)	9
<i>In re Williams Sec. Litig.</i> , 496 F. Supp. 2d 1195 (N.D. Okla. 2007).....	6
<i>In re Williams Sec. Litig.</i> , 558 F.3d 1130 (10th Cir. 2009)	5

PAGES 1-10 INTENTIONALLY OMITTED

Dated: November 20, 2015
New York, New York

Respectfully Submitted,

PAUL, WEISS, RIFKIND, WHARTON & GARRISON LLP

By: 

Brad S. Karp (bkarp@paulweiss.com)
John F. Baughman (jbaughman@paulweiss.com)
Jessica S. Carey (jcarey@paulweiss.com)
Jonathan H. Hurwitz (jhurwitz@paulweiss.com)

1285 Avenue of the Americas
New York, New York 10019-6064
(212) 373-3000
Attorneys for Defendant The Bear Stearns Companies Inc.

David S. Frankel (dfrankel@kramerlevin.com)
KRAMER LEVIN NAFTALIS & FRANKEL LLP
1177 Avenue of the Americas
New York, New York 10036
(212) 715-9100
Attorneys for Defendant James E. Cayne

David B. Anders (DBAnders@wlrk.com)
WACHTELL, LIPTON, ROSEN & KATZ
51 West 52nd Street
New York, New York 10019
(212) 403-1000
Attorneys for Defendant Warren J. Spector